

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY SELECT COMMITTEE ON REDISTRICTING AND ELECTIONS**

**Thirty-Third Special Session
November 15, 2021**

The Select Committee on Redistricting and Elections was called to order by Chair Brittney Miller at 10:32 a.m. on Monday, November 15, 2021, online and in Room 3138 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda ([Exhibit A](#)), the Attendance Roster ([Exhibit B](#)), and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/81st2021.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Brittney Miller, Chair
Assemblyman Steve Yeager, Vice Chair
Assemblywoman Teresa Benitez-Thompson
Assemblyman Jason Frierson
Assemblywoman Alexis Hansen
Assemblywoman Sandra Jauregui
Assemblyman Glen Leavitt
Assemblyman Andy Matthews
Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno
Assemblywoman Rochelle T. Nguyen
Assemblywoman Jill Tolles

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Robin L. Titus, Assembly District 38
Assemblyman John Ellison, Assembly District 33
Assemblywoman Jill Dickman, Assembly District 31

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Asher Killian, Chief Deputy Legislative Counsel
Michael Stewart, Research Director
Haley Proehl, Senior Policy Analyst and Geographic Information System Specialist
Kathy Steinle, Redistricting Specialist



Julieanna McManus, Committee Secretary
Carmen Neveau, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Emily Persaud-Zamora, Executive Director, Silver State Voices
Maria Nieto Orta, Nevada Political Director, Mi Familia Vota
Noé Orosco, Member, Nevadans Count Coalition
Holly Welborn, Policy Director, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada
Taylor Patterson, Executive Director, Native Voters Alliance Nevada
Eric Jeng, Director of Outreach, Asian Community Development Council
Benjamín Challinor, Policy Director, Faith in Action Nevada
Maria-Teresa Liebermann-Parraga, Deputy Director, Battle Born Progress
Nick Arellano, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Sylvia Lazos, Private Citizen, Henderson, Nevada
Natalie Hernandez, Director of Organizing, Make the Road Nevada
Guillermo Barahona, Civic Engagement Director, Chispa Nevada
Jim Hindle, Vice Chair, Nevada Republican Party
André Wade, State Director, Silver State Equality
Quentin Savvoir, Deputy Director, Make It Work Nevada
Vanessa Collins, Nevada State Program Manager, Care in Action
Christopher Roman, Private Citizen, Henderson, Nevada
Felicia Hayes, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Tammi Tiger, Chair, Board of Directors, Las Vegas Indian Center
Hawah Ahmad, Chair, Washoe County Senior Services Advisory Board
Anna Villatoro, Communications Coordinator, Children's Advocacy Alliance

Chair Miller:

Good morning, everyone. I am Assemblywoman Brittney Miller, and I have the privilege of chairing the Assembly Select Committee on Redistricting and Elections. I would like to welcome everyone—and that includes those here watching in Carson City or anyone watching us online—this morning to the Assembly Select Committee on Redistricting and Elections. We have already had a joint hearing on Senate Bill 1. We did that on Saturday. The purpose of today's hearing is to consider the proposed amendment. [Roll was called. Committee rules and protocol were explained.]

With that, we will move on to the amendment for Senate Bill 1. Committee members and those listening online, as you know, we did hear Senate Bill 1 in a joint hearing on Saturday. You will recall that we received considerable testimony on the measure, including valuable public input that has helped us shape the amendment for S.B. 1. This is what we are considering today.

A few of those adjustments to the congressional maps include adjustments to districts to account for updated inmate addresses provided by the Nevada Department of Corrections in order to comply with the constitutional zero-deviation requirement and adjustments to move

the Walker River Paiute Reservation entirely into Congressional District (CD) 4. Adjustments to the legislative maps include ensuring the Reno-Sparks Indian Colony is contained entirely in Assembly District 32; ensuring the Sun Valley neighborhood in Washoe County is contained entirely in Assembly District 27; and moving the entirety of Lander County into Assembly District 32 and portions of Eureka and Elko Counties, including the City of Carlin, into Assembly District 33. Those were the updates.

As we did on Saturday, our Legislative Counsel Bureau staff has been asked to present only the factual highlights of the proposed amendment and describe the geographic population and demographic changes set forth in the S.B. 1 amendment. They will not be able to explain or answer questions relating to the rationale or reasons for a particular mapping choice. Instead, LCB [Legislative Counsel Bureau] staff will cover the informational aspects of the amendment and highlight adjustments proposed in the amendment.

Our presenters today are Michael Stewart, our Research Director of the Research Division; Haley Proehl, Senior Policy Analyst and GIS [Geographic Information System] Specialist with the Research Division; and Kathy Steinle, Redistricting Specialist with LCB's Information Technology Services. They will be conducting the review today.

With that, I will ask that you approach. I understand you will need a few minutes to prepare, but we are ready whenever you would like to proceed.

Michael Stewart, Research Director:

Good morning, Chair Miller and members of the Assembly Select Committee on Redistricting and Elections. As Chair Miller noted, I am Michael Stewart with the Research Division of the Legislative Counsel Bureau. Joining me today is Haley Proehl, our Senior Policy Analyst and GIS Specialist with the Research Division, and Kathy Steinle, GIS Specialist with LCB's Information Technology Services unit. We have been asked today to provide factual information regarding the amendment you have before you this morning relating to Senate Bill 1.

Before we begin, I must remind you of our standard LCB disclosure that as central nonpartisan staff, we cannot advocate for the passage or defeat of any legislation or, in this case, any reapportionment or redistricting proposal or any amendment thereto. We are here today to present only the basic factual information and changes offered in the amendment. We will not be able to answer questions relating to the rationale of why a district boundary may have been drawn one way and not the other, as those were decisions made by the authors of S.B. 1 and the proposed amendment you have.

With each plan—congressional, State Senate, and Assembly—Ms. Proehl, as she did on Saturday, will start with the explanation of the key changes proposed and the geographic components and features of the overall plan and some district-specific information. Ms. Steinle will follow with an overview of any amendments to the district population and relevant deviations from the ideal population as well as other related statistical data.

Finally, I will highlight certain information impacted by the proposed amendment regarding race and ethnic minority concentrations.

You should have before you the copies of the associated maps and tables for the amendment [[Exhibit C](#), [Exhibit D](#), [Exhibit E](#), [Exhibit F](#), [Exhibit G](#), and [Exhibit H](#)]. For members of the public and those following over the Internet, all of this information has been uploaded to NELIS [Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System]. With that, I will turn it over to Haley Proehl to begin with the geographic features.

Haley Proehl, Senior Policy Analyst and Geographic Information System Specialist:

For the record, Haley Proehl, Senior Policy Analyst and GIS Specialist with LCB. The congressional plan will probably be the shortest summary that I will give [[Exhibit C](#)]. The changes were pretty minor with the amendment, but the changes include moving the entirety of the Walker River Paiute Reservation into Congressional District 4. Congressional District 2 also gained some area in Lyon County. In the south in Clark County, Districts 1 and 3 saw various minimal changes along their borders. The counties that are divided among congressional districts in this plan include Clark, Churchill, Lyon, and Lincoln Counties. I will pass it over to Ms. Steinle.

Kathy Steinle, Redistricting Specialist:

For the record, my name is Kathy Steinle. I am with the IT [Information Technology] Services unit of the Legislative Counsel Bureau. For the congressional amended plan, the four congressional districts have nearly even population: 776,153 for Districts 1 and 3 and 776,154 for Districts 2 and 4 [page 1, [Exhibit D](#)]. To review, the ideal population is calculated by dividing the number of districts into the total state population. Thus, 3,104,614 divided by 4 equals 776,153.5. Therefore, due to rounding, the deviation numbers are actually minus 0.5 for Districts 1 and 3 and 0.5 for Districts 2 and 4. By adding the largest positive deviation to the largest negative deviation, the result is an overall range of deviation of 1, which is 0 percent. Compared to the congressional plan in S.B. 1, there is no change in the overall deviation.

Michael Stewart:

In review of the racial data report [page 2, [Exhibit D](#)], what I will do is highlight the changes that were from S.B. 1 in its original form to what is being proposed in this amendment, just to run down some numbers.

For the White Alone category, the change for District 1 was a negative 2,777; in District 2, it was a plus of 84 persons; in District 3, it was an increase of 726 persons; and in District 4, it was an increase of 1,976 persons. For Black or African American, in District 1, it was a change of minus 13; the number remained the same in District 2; it was a change of minus 544 in District 3; and an addition of 557 in District 4.

For American Indian and Alaskan Native, it was a change of plus 28 in District 1; plus 5 in District 2; minus 78 in District 3; and plus 45 in District 4. For Asian, it was a change of negative 775 in District 1; negative 1 in District 2; plus 48 in District 3; and plus 728 in

District 4. In Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander, District 1 saw a decrease of 81; there was no change in District 2; District 3 had a decrease of 41; and District 4 had an increase of 122.

For the Some Other Race Alone category, in District 1, there was a change of minus 2,219; an increase of 2 in District 2; a decrease of 314 in District 3; and a decrease of 1,907 in District 4. For the Two or More Races category, there was an increase of 821 in District 1; a decrease of 5 in District 2; an increase, I think, of 134 in District 3; and a decrease of 950 in District 4.

Finally, for Hispanic, in District 1, there was an increase of 3,774; in District 2, it was a decrease of 6; in District 3, a decrease of 389; and in District 4, a decrease of 3,379.

Sorry for all the numbers, but those are kind of the raw data for you. I will turn it back over to Ms. Proehl to run through Senate.

Haley Proehl:

For the Senate plan [[Exhibit E](#)], the proposed amendment retains a 21-district Senate plan but makes changes to 6 of the Senate districts in the bill, all of which are located in the northern and western parts of the state. The districts with changes include Districts 13 through 17 and 19.

District 13, which is established by S.B. 1 as wholly within Washoe County and containing portions of Reno and Sparks, now contains additional portions of Sparks. District 14, which is established by S.B. 1 as containing all of Humboldt and Pershing Counties and portions of Elko, Eureka, Lander, and Washoe Counties, now contains all of Lander County. Portions of Elko County, including the City of Carlin, are moved out of District 14 and into District 19. District 19 also contains portions of Clark, Elko, Eureka, and Nye Counties and all of Lincoln and White Pine Counties.

Additionally, the populated portions of Sun Valley were previously split by Districts 14 and 15 and are now all within District 15. The town of Verdi, previously in District 14, is now in District 16, which also contains Carson City and Storey County as well as portions of Washoe County.

Finally, changes to District 17 include the loss of portions of Lander County. In addition to Clark and Washoe Counties, three counties are divided among districts in the plan: Elko, Eureka, and Nye.

I will pass it on to Ms. Steinle.

Kathy Steinle:

For the Senate plan, the ideal population for a 21-district Senate plan is 147,839 [page 1, [Exhibit F](#)]. In the amended Senate plan, the largest positive deviation is in District 19 and is 1,925, which is 1.3 percent. The largest negative deviation is in District 17 and is minus

3,918, which is minus 2.65 percent. Therefore, the overall range of deviation is 5,843, which is 3.95 percent. Compared to the Senate plan in S.B. 1, the overall deviation went from 3.28 percent to 3.95 percent, for a percent change of 0.67 between the two plans.

Michael Stewart:

Turning to the racial categories [page 2, [Exhibit F](#)]. Again, I would like to point out in the Senate plan the districts impacted—the numbers changed for this table were Districts 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 19. Those were the result of boundary changes as part of this amendment. So just looking at the high and low changes, District 14, for the White Alone category, had a low change of 1,886, and District 19 had the high change of 2,294. If you would like, I can do the percentages or just the numbers. For Black or African American, the district with the highest additional population in that category was District 14 with the addition of 202 persons, and District 13 had a subtraction of 176 persons.

Chair Miller:

Mr. Stewart, if you could provide those percentages, please.

Michael Stewart:

Sure. I can. For the White Alone category, the highest negative percentage change was in District 14. The highest negative percentage change was negative 0.95 percent, so close to 1 percent. The highest plus percentage was a 0.56 percent increase for the White Alone category in District 19.

Turning to Black or African American, Including Black or African American with Another Race(s), the change in District 14 was an addition of 202 persons, and that was also the highest percentage change at 0.15 percent. The change in District 13 was the highest negative change and that was a loss of 176 with the percentage of negative 0.09 percent. That was the range there.

With regard to American Indian and Alaskan Native, District 19 saw the highest increase of 130 persons, and District 15 had the highest negative change at negative 68. In terms of the percentage change, the highest percentage change was 0.05 percent for District 14 and negative 0.03 percent in District 15.

For Asian, Including Asian with Another Race(s), Senate District 14 picked up 279, and District 15 lost 377. District 14 had a positive percent change of 0.22 percent, and District 15 also had a negative change of 0.22 percent. For Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander, the highest addition was in District 14 at 0.05 percent, and the largest loss was 57 persons in District 13 at 0.03 percent.

Under the Some Other Race Alone category, District 14, the highest pickup in this category was 737 persons, and that was a 0.55 percent increase. The largest loss was 689 persons in Senate District 13, and that was a 0.35 percent decrease. For the Two or More Races category, the highest change for this category was in District 19 at plus 253 persons, and the largest negative number was District 13 with negative 323. The biggest positive percent

change was District 14 at 0.09 percent, and the largest negative percent change was in District 13 at 0.13 percent.

Finally, for Hispanic or Latino of any race, the largest increase was in District 14 at 987 persons, and the largest decrease was 1,052 in District 13. The increase in District 14 represented 0.79 percent. The decrease in District 13 represented negative 0.49 percent.

That covers the general statistics for the Senate side. I will turn it back over to Ms. Proehl.

Haley Proehl:

Moving on to the Assembly plan [[Exhibit G](#)], the proposed amendment retains a 42-district Assembly plan but makes changes to 9 of the Assembly districts, all of which reside in the northern and western parts of the state. The Assembly districts changed by the amendment include Districts 25 through 27, 30 through 33, 36, and 38.

District 25, which is wholly within Washoe County and contains portions of Reno, lost some areas of west Reno but gained additional areas in central and south Reno. District 26, another district wholly contained within Washoe County along the western edge of the state and including Incline Village and portions of Reno, now contains the town of Verdi, which was previously in District 32. District 27 in Washoe County now contains all populated portions of Sun Valley, which were previously split by Districts 27 and 31. District 30, also in Washoe County and containing the City of Sparks core, saw minimal change and gained only a few portions of the City of Sparks from District 31.

District 32, which was established by S.B. 1 to include all of Humboldt and Pershing Counties and portions of Elko, Eureka, Lander, and Washoe Counties, now contains all of Lander County. Portions of Elko County, including the City of Carlin, are moved out of District 32 and into District 33, which contains portions of Elko, Eureka, Lincoln, and Nye Counties and all of White Pine County. District 36, which contains portions of Clark County and portions of Pahrump and Nye County, saw minimal change to include roughly three additional square miles of the Pahrump area. Finally, changes to District 38 include the loss of portions of Lander County.

There are seven counties that are divided among Assembly districts in the amendment and those include Clark, Elko, Eureka, Lincoln, Lyon, Nye, and Washoe. All Assembly districts are nested within Senate districts in this amendment, as was the case in the original bill, so two Assembly districts are wholly contained within one Senate district. Those pairings—the Assembly districts that are within each Senate district—are on the Senate table [page 1, [Exhibit F](#)].

Kathy Steinle:

The ideal population for a 42-district Assembly plan is 73,919 [page 1, [Exhibit H](#)]. In the amended Assembly plan, the largest positive deviation is in District 33 and is 1,215, which is 1.64 percent. The largest negative deviation is in District 38 and is minus 2,251, which is minus 3.05 percent. Therefore, the overall range of deviation is 3,466, which is 4.69 percent.

Compared to the Assembly plan in S.B. 1, the overall deviation went from 3.53 percent to 4.69 percent, for a percent change of 1.16 percent between the two plans.

Michael Stewart:

The districts impacted with the racial categories [page 2, [Exhibit H](#)] because of geographic changes in the Assembly are Districts 25, 26, 27, 30, 31, 32, 33, 36, and 38. Again, I will highlight the highs and lows of those impacted districts.

For the White Alone category, the largest change was a plus 1,230 in District 33. District 31 saw the largest negative change at 1,076. In District 31, that is a percentage of negative 1.09 percent. As I mentioned, in District 33, that is a change of positive 0.49 percent.

Turning to the Black or African American, Including Black or African American with Another Race(s) category, the district gaining the most in this category is District 31 at plus 115 persons with an increase of 0.18 percent. The largest loss was minus 176 in District 30, and that was a change of negative 0.16 percent.

Turning to the American Indian and Alaskan Native, Including American Indian and Alaskan Native with Another Race(s) category, the district with the highest change in that category was Assembly District 33 with an increase of 74 persons. That amounts to a statistical change of zero. The low was District 30 at negative 65, and that is a statistical change of 0.02 percent.

Turning to Asian and Asian with another race, the district gaining the most in this category is District 31 with an increase of 378 persons. That is a percent change of positive 0.57 percent. The district with the most loss in that category is negative 345, and that is a percent change of negative 0.42 percent.

Turning to the Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander, Including Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander with Another Race(s) category, the district with the highest increase in this category was plus 46 persons at a 0.7 percent increase. The district with the largest loss was negative 57 in District 30 with negative 0.05 percent.

For the Some Other Race Alone category, the high increase in this category was found in District 32 with plus 424 persons, an increase of 0.63 percent. The largest loss is a negative 689 in District 30. That is negative 0.62 percent. For the Two or More Races category, the district receiving the largest increase in this category is District 27. That is plus 164, an increase of 0.35 percent. The district with the negative loss in this category is District 30 at negative 323, and that is a negative 0.21 percent.

Finally, for Hispanic or Latino of any race, the district picking up the most in this category was District 32 at plus 674, or an increase of 1.03 percent. The district with the highest number of losses, 1,052 persons, is a negative 0.84 percent.

I think that covers it. I apologize for all the statistics, but that is what redistricting is about. We are happy to answer questions if we can. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Chair Miller:

Thank you for that presentation. Before I open it up to questions from our members, I want to ensure that everyone interesting in testifying has time to call in through the phone lines. We do have Spanish translation services today, so if there is anyone that will be speaking in Spanish, we do have translation services available. We will have a few minutes for people to call in while we are in our question section. With that, members, do we have any questions for our LCB staff? The first question will be from Vice Chair Yeager.

Assemblyman Yeager:

Thank you so much, Madam Chair. I had a question for Legal, so probably Mr. Killian is the best one to answer. In looking at some of the overall deviation numbers that I believe changed somewhat in these proposed maps, I wanted to confirm that the deviations proposed in the maps we have seen are legally defensible in Legal's opinion.

Asher Killian, Chief Deputy Legislative Counsel:

This may be repeating a little bit of the information the Committee has heard before, but generally a redistricting plan for state legislative districts is defensible so long as the deviation is less than 10 percent overall, so less than plus or minus 5 percent in the individual districts. This plan is still well under that amount. The deviation has increased from the previous plan, but I believe the overall deviations were in the neighborhood of 4 to 5 percent, which is still well under that 10 percent overall threshold.

Chair Miller:

I want to remind members, too, that questions will only be pertaining specifically to the proposed amendment because we have already had a hearing on the actual Senate bill.

Assemblyman Matthews:

Good morning and thank you to all of our presenters. I wanted to stay on that same topic. I have just a few questions, but they all pertain to the issue of population size and deviation from the ideal. I know that in the hearing on this bill, I and some others expressed some concerns on that topic. The reason I keep coming back to it, and the reason I think it is so important, is that one of the actual constitutional requirements governing the redistricting process is that we minimize those deviation levels. So my question is for Ms. Steinle, just to make sure that I have a clear understanding. I believe that it was established in the hearing on S.B. 1 that the maps drawn in 2011—this is the legislative maps—had deviation figures of 0.8 percent for the Senate and 1.33 percent for the Assembly. Is that correct?

Chair Miller:

Assemblyman Matthews, is this question pertaining to the Senate bill or to the proposed amendment?

Assemblyman Matthews:

The proposed amendment. For context, I just want to make sure that—my question has to do with the change, this proposed amended map compared to the maps we looked at on Saturday. I am trying to establish some context for that question.

Kathy Steinle:

Yes, the deviation in 2011 for the State Senate was 0.8 percent and for the State Assembly, 1.33 percent.

Assemblyman Matthews:

Okay, thank you. And I believe that for the maps that we heard on Saturday in the hearing, those deviation figures for the Senate were 3.28 percent and for the Assembly, 3.53 percent. Is that correct?

Kathy Steinle:

That is correct.

Assemblyman Matthews:

I think I noted at the time that that was a significant increase in those deviation levels. We also saw in that hearing some maps introduced from the minority party. Correct me if I am wrong, but I believe that in those maps, the deviation levels were 0.94 percent for the Senate and 1.06 percent for the Assembly. Is that correct?

Chair Miller:

Assemblyman Matthews, is this pertaining specifically to the proposed amendment? Can you rephrase the question to make sure that it pertains specifically to the amendment?

Assemblyman Matthews:

Regarding the proposed amended maps, I believe—and I wanted to make sure that I heard you accurately a few moments ago—the deviation levels for the Senate would be 3.95 percent and for the Assembly 4.69 percent. Is that what you said?

Kathy Steinle:

That is correct.

Assemblyman Matthews:

Okay, I appreciate that. Unless I am missing something, it would appear that these amended maps, rather than address or mitigate some of those concerns about the increase in those deviation levels, actually are going the other direction. Under the amended version, we actually have even greater deviation from the ideal than we saw in the original S.B. 1. Is that correct?

Kathy Steinle:

That is correct.

Assemblywoman Tolles:

Good to see you all. I cannot wait for all of us to get more sleep, but especially all of you because I know you have been working around the clock. I would like to revisit some of the questions that I asked on Saturday as they compare specifically to this new amendment in regard to the splits of communities, just so I can get a comparison. Then I have some other specific questions regarding an Assembly district.

Under these new amended plans, could you review for us how many counties, how many cities and towns, how many tribal communities, how many HOAs [homeowners' associations], and how many general improvement districts will be split for congressional, Senate, and Assembly?

Haley Proehl:

We had some time this morning to look into that, so I think I could get to some of your questions, but I may need to follow up on others. Starting with which counties are split in these plans, the congressional plan divides Clark, Churchill, Lincoln, and Lyon Counties. The Senate plan divides Clark, Elko, Eureka, Nye, and Washoe Counties. The Assembly plan splits Clark, Elko, Eureka, Lincoln, Lyon, Nye, and Washoe Counties. So that was 7 for the Assembly.

Assemblywoman Tolles:

Thank you. And if you can give the number, that is helpful, like you did just then.

Haley Proehl:

There are 7 for the Assembly plan, 5 for the Senate plan, and 4 for the congressional plan.

In terms of tribal community splits, the congressional plan in S.B. 1 originally split the Walker River Paiute Reservation. That is no longer split in the amendment, so there are zero tribal community splits for the congressional plan. We looked at U.S. Census Bureau boundary data for all of these areas to compare which were split, so some areas do include unpopulated and populated regions. We did not have a chance to look into that, but in our analysis for the Senate plan for this amendment, what were split were the Washoe Ranches Land Trust, the Stewart community, the Pyramid Lake Paiute Reservation, the Timbisha Shoshone Reservation, and the Reno-Sparks Indian Colony. There are a few parcels belonging to them in the Reno area. For the Assembly plan, those same 5 are split: the Reno-Sparks Indian Colony, Washoe Ranches Land Trust, Pyramid Lake Paiute Reservation, Timbisha Shoshone Reservation, and Stewart community.

For the cities and towns, we looked at the places layer provided by the Census Bureau that includes cities and census-designated places. There are a total of 7 cities and census-designated places split by the congressional plan, 16 split by the Senate plan, and 21 split by the Assembly plan.

For HOAs, we did find HOA boundary data for the City of Las Vegas, but we are not able to find any other data that we could do this analysis with for other parts of the state. For those

HOAs, I have them for S.B. 1, but I would need to look at the updated figures for the amendments. I do have that right here, though. The Senate plan in the amendment would split 13 registered HOAs in the City of Las Vegas, the Assembly plan would split 15 registered HOAs in the City of Las Vegas, and the congressional plan would split 2 HOAs.

I hope that answered all the questions you had.

Assemblywoman Tolles:

Thank you. I think the only one that we did not have is the GIDs, the general improvement districts.

Haley Proehl:

I do have that information as well. These I believe are Washoe County GIDs. There were zero split in the congressional plan, 2 split in the Senate plan, and 3 split in the Assembly plan.

Assemblywoman Tolles:

Thank you. Again, just recognizing that that is not the entire state, but it gives us a picture of splits in Washoe for GIDs and in Clark, or Las Vegas specifically, for HOAs. I appreciate that information. As you can imagine, I am concerned about the whole state. May I just make a note that I was happy to see the pizza slice that had been taken out of the congressional district for Smith Valley has been restored. I do also want to note that it does still appear to split directly through Smith Valley.

My question is specific to Assembly District 25. Do you happen to know what percentage and/or what number of constituents that currently reside in Assembly District 25 have been displaced to either Assembly District 32 or Assembly District 26 or transferred over under this amended plan? To refer back to your opening comments, you mentioned Cold Springs, Verdi, and a significant split of Somersett communities are being taken and moved.

Haley Proehl:

I will have to follow up on that data with those districts. We were not able to completely get to that before this meeting, but that is something we can look into.

Assemblywoman Tolles:

Thank you, I appreciate that. I will look forward to seeing how many of those constituents are moving to another district. Could you remind me again, under this amended version, what the deviation is for Assembly District 25?

Kathy Steinle:

Yes. For Assembly District 25 in the amendment, the deviation is minus 1,453, which is minus 1.97 percent.

Assemblywoman Tolles:

Thank you. Madam Chair, just two more follow-up questions, please?

Chair Miller:

Assemblywoman Tolles, I will come back to you. I would like to give other members an opportunity to ask questions, so I will circle back to you.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson:

The amended version of the maps encapsulates the additional data that we were able to receive from the Nevada Department of Corrections regarding prisoners who lived in Nevada who had addresses, so I, one, want to confirm that that data is reflected here, and secondly, I did not know if you could quantify those additional addresses or persons that were added.

Haley Proehl:

That is correct. These maps use the additional inmate addresses that were reallocated. There were a total of 1,612 inmates that were reallocated this round.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson:

And then just to do a follow-up, the amendments that we are seeing are the only proposed maps that do include the data from the Nevada Department of Corrections, correct?

Haley Proehl:

Correct. They are the only maps with the added data.

Assemblyman Yeager:

Again, this is for Legal. This may sound somewhat similar to what was brought up in our joint hearing a couple days ago. I asked this question because we have had some discussion about deviation and the deviation that exists in the current maps that were drawn in 2011, versus what is proposed today versus what was proposed a couple of days ago. I thought it might be nice to ask Legal again for a description of, at least in their mind, why the 2011 maps had such a low deviation and why the maps that you see here with their higher deviation would still be legally defensible. So if you could touch on that, perhaps, for the benefit of those who were not able to tune in to the joint hearing either here, in person, or online.

Asher Killian:

Madam Chair, with your indulgence, I will repeat a little bit of that information from the previous hearings. In the 2011 redistricting process, the Legislature did pass two redistricting bills, both of which were vetoed by the Governor. The Governor then declined to call the Legislature into special session to be able to consider further redistricting legislation. As a result, the task of redistricting fell to the courts. The district court here in Carson City appointed three Special Masters to conduct the redistricting process and assigned a number of rules for the Special Masters to follow when doing that redistricting.

Typically, when redistricting falls to the courts rather than the Legislature, the courts follow traditional districting principles in an attempt to keep any sort of partisanship out of the process. Part of the direction given to the Special Masters by the court in 2011 was to minimize overall deviations, and that was made a priority by the court. I believe the standard that the court established is that in no event could any district have a deviation of more than 2 percent, and the target deviation was 0.5 percent. So the court prioritized that as a much more important factor than what is constitutionally required for the Legislature, which is merely that the districts have an overall range of less than 10 percent—so plus or minus 5 percent in any particular district. As a result, the lines that are in effect right now have very small deviations because that is what the court was targeting during its 2011 process with the Special Masters.

In terms of what rules apply to the Legislature, the *Nevada Constitution* requires that the Legislature perform redistricting on the basis of census population. The federal *Constitution* requires relatively equal population between the districts. As mentioned, that is plus or minus 5 percent or less than 10 percent overall, which is generally safe as long as some legitimate basis exists for the deviation for legislative districts, and then, of course, the requirements of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments and the Voting Rights Act for equitable treatment of racial and language minorities. The amended plan before the Committee right now has a deviation of between 4 and 5 percent for the Assembly and the Senate districts, which is still well under that 10 percent overall standard that applies to the Legislature, even though it is greater than the standard that the court applied when drawing maps itself. But the Legislature has much more freedom for a higher level of deviation than the court assigned to itself during that 2011 process.

I hope that is sufficient background and it fully answers the question, but I am happy to follow up if there is further information that is required.

Assemblyman Leavitt:

In accordance with the new amended maps, how I am looking at it when we are talking about some of the demographic information, it looks like CD 1 on the congressional map was at 42 percent when you are talking about the Hispanic or Latino population, and it dropped to 36 percent. Am I reading that right?

Michael Stewart:

Stand by for one second. I am looking for my other chart. Let me start with CD 1 in the unamended S.B. 1. The percentage of Hispanic was 35.45 percent. The proposed amendment is 35.93 percent. That is how I think I am seeing that there.

Assemblyman Leavitt:

Thank you for that clarification. I am not as great at reading the technical stuff as you guys are, so I wanted some clarification on that.

We talked a little bit about the Hispanic districts over 40 percent, the African-American districts over 20 percent, and the Asian districts over 20 percent on the previous bill, but in

reference to the amended version, did we see any increases in districts with those populations?

Michael Stewart:

I did not have a whole lot of time this morning, but I did a quick analysis of—on Saturday, you asked how many we had above a certain threshold, and I wanted to see if there was any change in any of those districts that were at the top. I quickly looked at Senate because then that, since we are nested, would probably reflect the same answers. From what I could quickly tell, there were no changes in those top categories throughout the Senate plan and the Assembly plan.

Assemblyman Leavitt:

So there is no change between the proposed plan and the amended plan?

Michael Stewart:

In terms of the top percentages. I would have to go through and really look at very small tenths of percents and that sort of thing, which I could do for you.

Assemblywoman Tolles:

Just to be clear, I know that we have diversified immensely over this last ten years since the 2010 Census. If I heard you correctly, we have not added any districts that add or increase more of the minority voice, either in Hispanic, Black, or Asian. Is that correct? We have kept the same number of districts at over 40 percent Hispanic from ten years ago, over 20 percent Black, and over 20 percent Asian. So there has been no change in increasing that representative voice by district even though we have diversified immensely over the last ten years?

Michael Stewart:

I think we can look quickly for you.

Assemblywoman Tolles:

It is an important question.

Michael Stewart:

Thanks for your patience. We are doing this on the fly. I appreciate that.

Assemblywoman Tolles:

That is okay. It is important and worth being patient for.

Michael Stewart:

Okay, I think we can cover this now. In 2011, there were 7 districts that were above 40 percent Hispanic in the Assembly. There were 3 districts that had over 20 percent in the Black or African-American community. Again in 2011, there were 3 districts that were over 20 percent in the Asian category. In this proposed amendment, there are 7 districts in the Hispanic category in the Assembly that are over 40 percent. In the proposed amendment,

there are 5 districts over 20 percent in the Black or African-American community in the Assembly. In the Assembly in this proposed amendment, there are 4 Asian districts over 20 percent, including Asian with another race. So we saw the same number for Hispanic and an increase of 1 district for Asian and 2 for African American. That is in the Assembly.

Assemblywoman Tolles:

Thank you. Just to be clear, that is versus the 2011 representation numbers. Do we have that compared to what is represented today, before this amended plan?

Michael Stewart:

We would have to go back to what we said on Saturday. I apologize.

Assemblywoman Tolles:

That is okay. I have down that today it was 5 Black and 8 Hispanic over 40 percent. Currently in 2020, 5 Black and 5 Asian, which means actually that we lost 1 district according to this new amended proposal, down to 7 for Hispanic representation over 40 percent. We kept the same at 5 for the Black community, and we lost for the Asian community at 4 proposed districts. I am happy to be corrected if that is wrong.

Michael Stewart:

We are looking. We do not have the unamended in front of us at the moment, but I can give you the Senate right now that we were just talking about for 2011 and in this amended proposal. We will see what we can find for your other question.

So in 2011—this is the State Senate plan—there were 5 Hispanic districts over 40 percent. In the proposed amendment, there are 4 over 40 percent. In 2011, there were 2 Black or African-American Senate districts that were over 20 percent. The proposed amendment shows 2. In 2011, there was 1 Asian district over 20 percent. The proposed amendment is 2. Those numbers did not change, by the way, from the proposal that you heard on Saturday. That, again, was for the Senate. We are doing a quick calculation on the Assembly.

Ms. Tolles, I think you are asking the comparison from the plans presented on Saturday—maybe you can restate what else we need to provide for you. I apologize.

Assemblywoman Tolles:

In 2020, how many districts, according to the census, are represented at each of those levels—so over 40 percent Hispanic, over 20 percent Black, and over 20 percent Asian? In other words, how many districts currently meet those criteria in representation? I think we already established that this proposal gives us 7 Assembly districts with over 40 percent Hispanic, 5 Black over 20 percent, and 4 Asian over 20 percent. I would like to know if we are gaining, losing, or keeping the same as what we have today sitting in the 63 among us.

Michael Stewart:

We see what you are getting at, so we are going to see if we can find it. If we may follow up in a little bit, Ms. Steinle is going to look it up for you, if we can do that. Thank you for your patience.

Assemblywoman Tolles:

Thank you. I appreciate it. Again, it is important.

Chair Miller:

As soon as you are ready, let us know and we will circle back to that question.

Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno:

As we look at the state of Nevada, we have a large number of non-white districts within the 63 districts. Can you tell us how many non-white districts we had in 2011? Because as I look at it—and please correct me if I am wrong—of the 63 districts that we have right now, 29 of those districts are majority non-white districts, which means that Hispanic, Black, Indigenous, and Asian-American populations are growing throughout our state, not in one specific area of our state. Can you tell me how many of our non-white majority districts we had in 2011?

Michael Stewart:

Madam Chair, I might need to clarify with Ms. Monroe-Moreno. I am looking at just the Senate, for example, in 2011. Since those are nested, it might apply across the board. If you look at the White Alone category in 2011—trying to think of something that would constitute where White Alone was below 50 percent—in the Senate, I think that was just Districts 2 and 4. So that would suggest that the remaining minority categories added up to something higher than 50 percent. That same scenario in 2011—in the Assembly, Districts 6, 7, 12, 17, and 28 were below the 50 percent threshold in the White Alone category. With that, let me take a look at our current numbers and then I can tell you where that White Alone category fell below the 50 percent. Stand by for one second. We are just counting it right now.

Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno:

I understand. Thank you.

Michael Stewart:

Madam Chair and Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno, thank you for your patience. We are doing some calculations on the fly. I just told you that the Assembly in 2011 had 5 districts in the White Alone category that were below 50 percent. This proposed amendment has 20 now that are below 50 percent, which would suggest that all the other races on the table total up to higher than 50 percent in the Assembly.

I think in the Senate I mentioned that there were 2 districts in 2011 that were below a 50 percent White Alone category. This proposed amendment now reflects 9 districts that were below the 50 percent White Alone category. So there is certainly an increase over the

decade in the ethnic minority populations that looks generally across the board. Thank you for your patience as we pulled that up.

Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno:

I appreciate you doing that. Just to be clear, in 2011, there were 2 Senate districts that were a majority non-white, correct? And now we have 9.

Michael Stewart:

Ms. Monroe-Moreno, based on our quick calculation, that is correct.

Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno:

Can you give me the difference between the Assembly districts in 2011 that were majority non-white? Can I get those numbers again? I apologize.

Michael Stewart:

In 2011, there were 5 districts below 50 percent in the Assembly for the White Alone category. In the amendment you have before you today, there are 20 below 50 percent. So that is an increase from ten years ago to today.

Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno:

Thank you so much for doing that, and I appreciate you doing it on the fly. It shows the great diversity that the state of Nevada has and that it is growing throughout the state, not in one specific area within our state. Thank you so much.

Michael Stewart:

Thank you. Madam Chair, if I may, Ms. Steinle is wonderful. She did some quick number crunching for Assemblywoman Tolles. I think we can finish her answer on that one, if that is okay.

Chair Miller:

Yes, please.

Michael Stewart:

Assemblywoman Tolles, you asked where the current districts, based on 2020 Census data, fell as we stand today. I think you mentioned 8, 5, and 5, and that is correct. So 8 Hispanic districts—current districts from 2020 Census data—would be over 40 percent; 5 Asian districts would be over 20 percent; and 5 Black or African-American districts would be over 20 percent, based on 2020 data.

Assemblywoman Tolles:

May I clarify that?

Chair Miller:

Yes, Assemblywoman Tolles. Please clarify and then we will move on.

Assemblywoman Tolles:

Obviously, there is a lot of interest in this because we are concerned with the federal constitutional requirements of meeting Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act, and that is why we are digging in so deep.

We just heard about, from the last set of questions from the Assistant Majority Floor Leader, a different way to define that. So these were broken out by specific categories by race, then we just heard a clarification of where we have grown from 2011 to this proposed plan. In the same way that we clarified that there was growth organically that happened already in 2020, I wonder if you could give us the 2020 breakdown to the questions the Assistant Majority Floor Leader asked regarding how many districts fell below the 50 percent average. I believe she quoted 29. I want to clarify if that is correct because if we currently have 29 and this S.B. 1 gives us 20 Assembly districts below 50 percent and 9 Senate districts below 50 percent, then, once again, we actually have seen no change in S.B. 1 to what is currently represented. No increase.

Michael Stewart:

Okay, we are trying to look this up. We have to pull the 2020 overlays.

While Ms. Proehl is doing that, I think I can answer. I gave you the Assembly just now for the 2020. For the Senate, based on current districts from 2020 Census data, there would be 5 Hispanic districts over 40 percent. In the Senate, based on current 2020 Census data, there would be 2 Asian districts over 20 percent and 2 Black or African-American districts over 20 percent. That was, again, for the Senate. We are looking at 2020 Census numbers. Ms. Proehl is looking that up for us. We can follow up shortly.

Chair Miller:

Mr. Stewart, can I ask for clarification to your response? Are those the difference between the numbers from 2011 to 2021? Or are those—because it sounded like the question may have stated the difference between 2020 and 2021.

Michael Stewart:

The way we framed that answer was to take existing districts that you all are in now with the 2020 Census data overlaid in that. That is where we got that 2020 number—from taking 2020 Census data over and putting it into your existing districts as they are now.

Chair Miller:

Okay, and did you say that we are still waiting for a response to the other question?

Michael Stewart:

Yes, Madam Chair.

Chair Miller:

Okay. With that, we can move on to one final question from Assemblyman Matthews.

Assemblyman Matthews:

I had a follow-up question for Mr. Killian, if I may. You were asked by the Vice Chair, I believe it was, and I am going to be paraphrasing here, but you were asked to offer an explanation regarding the deviation from the ideal and what might account for the significant increase for the current maps as compared to 2011. I was taking notes on what you said. Again, I am going to be paraphrasing, but I believe what you offered as an explanation included that the 2011 process was characterized by a stricter adherence to traditional redistricting principles rather than by partisanship and that that was a key distinction between 2011 and what happened then and what is happening now. I wanted to make sure that my understanding of what you said was correct.

Asher Killian:

To clarify, in the 2011 process, the maps ultimately were not drawn by the Legislature. After the Legislature passed two bills to draw maps, they were vetoed by the Governor, and the Governor declined to call the Legislature back into special session, so the Legislature was constitutionally unable to perform its responsibility to redistrict. As a result, it fell to the courts. The courts follow a different standard. The *Nevada Constitution* gives the Legislature relatively unlimited discretion in how it chooses to draw maps, imposing only the requirement that they be based on census population, in addition to the federal requirements for relatively equal population and equitable treatment of racial and language minorities. However, nationwide, whenever the task falls to the courts, because it is an important factor for the courts to avoid any appearance of partisan bias in any form, they traditionally adhere much more closely to traditional districting principles rather than exercising the full suite of discretion that is made available to the Legislature. So in 2011, when it fell to the courts to draw the maps, they adhered not only to the traditional districting principles but to a very strict interpretation of those principles in order to avoid any appearance of partisan bias on the part of the courts.

Chair Miller:

Mr. Stewart, are you saying you are ready with your response? We will take that response and then we will take a final question from Assemblywoman Hansen. Please proceed with your response.

Haley Proehl:

I have an answer for Assemblywoman Tolles' question about the number of Senate and Assembly districts that are below 50 percent in the White Alone category with 2020 population data, but looking at the 2011 districts. For the current districts, as they stand today with 2020 Census data, there are 9 Senate districts below 50 percent in the White Alone category and 20 Assembly districts below 50 percent in the White Alone category.

Assemblywoman Hansen:

Thank you for being here. We know it is a difficult job. I wanted to follow up and see if you had time—and I understand if you have not. I had asked a question on Saturday about swing districts, if we had any historical data to help us interpret what "swing" really means. Is it 10 percent? Is it 4 percent?

Chair Miller:

Assemblywoman, is that question directed specifically to the proposed amendment?

Assemblywoman Hansen:

Yes.

Chair Miller:

Can you explain?

Assemblywoman Hansen:

We are trying to look at the overall conclusions of what S.B. 1 will do to districts, amended or not.

Chair Miller:

Assemblywoman, I am going to ask that you keep your questions specific to the proposed amendment.

Assemblywoman Hansen:

Well, I think it is.

Chair Miller:

I am going to ask the Legislative Counsel Bureau, is this something that can be answered under your purview? I know that you are speaking directly to data and demographics.

Michael Stewart:

We have struggled with what constitutes swing or not swing and that sort of thing. One consideration we are looking at is how voter registration compares to election results. So that is what might help kind of compare that, but we have not had a chance to look at district-by-district registration over the last ten years and then overlay it on top of election results. That might give you some sort of analysis of how registration versus general election results pair up. I know we started working on that, but we did not quite get finished. We can follow up with you.

Chair Miller:

Let me ask this question: Mr Killian, is there a legal definition of what a swing district is?

Asher Killian:

Particularly in Nevada, there is no such definition or standard for competitiveness or swinginess in elections. The only related concept that gets applied is, the interim redistricting study, before the 2021 Session, made a recommendation on which election databases to use on the basis of which elections had been most competitive to be useful in the redistricting process. There was no legal definition that applied there, either. I think the rubric used by the committee was just to choose the closest results to have the best possible data to import into the elections database. But in terms of evaluating district lines during the

redistricting process, there is no legal standard in Nevada that requires competitiveness, nor is there any definition of "competitiveness."

Assemblywoman Hansen:

Chair, thank you for letting me ask that question. I want to extend my thanks to LCB. I know that we literally were called into session on Friday. We all just saw the maps for the first time. We are asking questions of you and rhetorical questions to authors of maps, even though we do not know who they are, so we cannot get those questions answered. We appreciate that you have not had ample time to cover everything that we ask but do appreciate the tremendous lift that you have had to do. Thank you for your clarity.

Chair Miller:

Yes, take a breath. You have all done a tremendous job.

We will move into testimony for Senate Bill 1. We will start with those who wish to testify in support of the proposed amendment for Senate Bill 1 here in Carson City, then we will move to the telephone lines. We will then move to anyone testifying on the phones in Spanish who would need translation services. It is my understanding that our translators are available on the lines. Please notify everyone on the lines who is wishing to testify in Spanish that that opportunity is available.

Opening it up here in the room, if there is anyone here in the room who would like to testify in support of the amendment for Senate Bill 1, please approach. [There was no one.] I do not see anyone here in the room. Is there anyone on the lines who would like to testify in support of the amendment to Senate Bill 1? [There was no one.] Do we have anyone to provide testimony in support of the amendment for Senate Bill 1 in Spanish? [There was no one.]

With that, we will move into opposition testimony. If there is anyone here in the room who would like to testify in opposition, we will go from the room to the phones and then to our Spanish translation. With that, please begin when you are ready here in Carson City.

Emily Persaud-Zamora, Executive Director, Silver State Voices:

Good morning, Chair Miller and Committee members. For the record, my name is Emily Persaud-Zamora. I am the Executive Director of Silver State Voices, and today we still stand in opposition to S.B. 1.

On Saturday, community members and coalition partners testified in opposition to S.B. 1 due to the lack of accessibility and meaningful public input. When the majority's updated proposed congressional map was published last night, it was great to see that Walker River Paiute Tribe was kept in one congressional district, and we do thank this body for making that additional change. However, we still feel, including the map that was released right before this session started, that the maps that are proposed do not reflect the priorities and needs of your constituents. The Latinx community is the largest community in CD 1 with

over 300,000 residents, and the proposed map is blatantly disregarding their priorities and needs.

We all know redistricting happens once every ten years, so there is no going back. This is the time that we need to fix this and it is still not addressing—and you will hear from many coalition members that will say what are still the issues that we have with these particular maps. [Ms. Persaud-Zamora spoke in Spanish.] I can translate for myself. I just want to say really quickly in Spanish [Ms. Persaud-Zamora spoke in Spanish]. What I said is that we are going to continue advocating for our Latinx community because through all of the work that we have done, we keep hearing that folks are not happy with these maps and so we will continue advocating for them. Thank you.

Maria Nieto Orta, Nevada Political Director, Mi Familia Vota:

Good morning, Chair Miller and Committee members. For the record, my name is Maria Nieto Orta, and I am the Nevada Political Director at Mi Familia Vota. We are partners of the Nevadans Count Coalition. We are still in strong opposition to S.B. 1.

Two days ago, the body heard directly from my community, your Latinx constituents. We had people speaking in Spanish, their own language, about how separating the community is not what they want. We also have to keep in mind that this is out of their comfort zone for folks. Just having to speak in Spanish and in their native language—we are asking people to speak about how they feel—and for the way that they feel to not be taken in is really hurtful. As elected officials, it is your responsibility to champion what your constituents care about—from education to health care to housing justice—and do them right by those things. This process is a critical component of this.

While the effort to incorporate public input is commendable, this body has not done right by my community. That is evident by the revised proposed congressional map that was released last night. The body has ignored the feedback on the majority's proposed congressional district maps, specifically in Congressional District 1. If you want to correct this failure, you will vote no for S.B. 1 and go back to the drawing board. I encourage you to look at the revised map proposed by the Nevadans Count Coalition [[Exhibit I](#)]. Thank you.

Noé Orosco, Member, Nevadans Count Coalition:

Good afternoon. My name is Noé Orosco. I am with the Nevadans Count Coalition. On behalf of the coalition, I helped develop the two maps that have been submitted on the Legislature's redistricting website. Our updated plan, revised Nevadans Count, which is number 787 [[Exhibit I](#)], incorporates the most recently released data per A.B. 450 [Assembly Bill 450 of the 80th Session], which reallocates incarcerated people to their home communities. Additionally, our revised plan follows the principle of population equality, with Congressional Districts 2 and 3 each having the ideal population of 776,154 residents and Congressional Districts 1 and 4 each having 776,153 residents. That is a deviation of 1 person and a percentage of 0 percent.

We have been following the redistricting process since the beginning of the year. Before the interim redistricting committee was created, I had already met with the current demographer, the previous demographer, and the LCB [Legislative Counsel Bureau] staff. Further, because the Nevada redistricting website had not yet been created, our coalition was using free redistricting websites and resources. We created a congressional redistricting plan. Unfortunately, the Nevada redistricting website was not compatible with the free redistricting website we were using. Our coalition reached out to the LCB staff, and they were very helpful. Still, LCB staff was unable to upload our plan until Saturday, November 13. I think it is also important to note that before our map was successfully uploaded, we had been trying to recreate it on the Nevada redistricting website. Because we did not complete it before Saturday at around 7 a.m., our map was removed when the Legislature removed the old database.

As you are aware, on Saturday morning, the additional addresses from the incarcerated people were uploaded to the website. This means that every map that has been submitted prior to Saturday, November 13, would not have a deviation of 1 person. Essentially, all those maps could potentially become obsolete. To incorporate the new data and to ensure each district had a population deviation of 1, we have revised our submitted plan and uploaded it yesterday evening. We ask this body to consider the Nevadans Count Coalition map [\[Exhibit I\]](#). Again, that number is 787. I do have some exhibits. I do not know who I would be handing those off to. Thank you.

Holly Welborn, Policy Director, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada:

Good morning, Madam Chair and members of the Committee. My name is Holly Welborn. I am the Policy Director for the ACLU [American Civil Liberties Union] of Nevada. I also grew up in east Las Vegas, on Owens and Lamb, and I am a Latina. My grandmother was a migrant farmworker, so this issue is very near and dear to my heart as well.

I first want to thank the Legislature, the Executive Branch, the State Demographer, LCB, and others who adjusted the counts to reflect the inmate reallocation. You did the right thing. As the Governor's appointed inmate advocate, I thank you on behalf of Nevada's incarcerated population and their families. The ACLU of Nevada is a member organization of the Nevadans Count table, and we also oppose the maps along with our colleagues. The goal of Nevadans Count is to create a district, CD 1, where Latinx voters represent 40 percent of the district population; to remove communities with stark contrast to working-class Latino Nevadans on the east side of Las Vegas; and keep Congressional District 4 diverse, where Latino voters represent 30 percent of the population. In sum, the map proposed by the coalition [\[Exhibit I\]](#) increases the likelihood that the Latino community, who represent one-third of Nevada's population, is better positioned to elect the representative of their choice. With the amendment, we see that there is some movement but, of course, as others have stated, it is not enough.

The Latinx community living in east Las Vegas is numerous and compact. Congressional District 1 is currently 46 percent Latinx. The Latinx community in east and northeast Las Vegas consistently vote as a block. For example, in the 2020 election, 75 percent of

voters cast their ballot for Joe Biden, compared to 23 percent for Donald Trump in precincts in the heart of east Las Vegas. In contrast, the predominantly white, affluent communities that the majority intends to add to CD 1 voted the opposite. For example, precincts in Boulder City voted 66 percent of the time for Donald Trump and 34 percent of the time for Joe Biden. This highlights how polarized the districts will become. Under the proposed maps, the Latinx community in east Las Vegas would become an ineffective minority, unable to overcome the affluent high-voting areas of Boulder City, Seven Hills, MacDonald Ranch, and others. Any person of color would have to run in Congressional District 4, pitting communities against each other and robbing people of the opportunity to serve their communities. A state that is now majority minority should not accept this conclusion. The community is not asking to pack all Latinos in one congressional district, which would, indeed, quote, be "bad public policy" and "flatly illegal." The community is asking for congressional districts that do not dilute the political power of Nevada's fastest-growing community of interest. Thank you.

Taylor Patterson, Executive Director, Native Voters Alliance Nevada:

Good afternoon, Committee. My name is Taylor Patterson. I am the Executive Director of Native Voters Alliance Nevada and a member of the Bishop Paiute Tribe. I applaud the Committee for taking the feedback about tribal communities. We know this is a difficult process for our legislators, and we appreciate you trying to address our concerns. As you have heard, it is essential for our communities to be kept together. I am delighted to see that there were additional changes made this morning, but our Black and Brown brothers and sisters deserve the same opportunity that my community is receiving. If one of our communities is divided, all of our communities are divided. Last night, the Nevadans Count Coalition uploaded a revised version of the congressional district map [[Exhibit I](#)], which was created in consultation with all of your constituents. I urge this Committee to consider the proposed map. Thank you.

Eric Jeng, Director of Outreach, Asian Community Development Council:

Good afternoon. Thank you, Chair and Committee members. My name is Eric Jeng. I am the Director of Outreach for Asian Community Development Council, ACDC, serving the ever-growing Asian-American, Native Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander community statewide. Today, I come before this Committee deeply conflicted. I wish we were here and able to testify in support. We can see the effort being made for S.B. 1, recognizing the rapid growth and emerging coalition of the Asian-American and Pacific Islander community with the potential to have 20 percent or more residents in 1 congressional district, 3 Senate districts, and 7 Assembly districts. We are seeing the efforts being made that our communities are being heard, especially with the amendment, to incorporate more community input. However, we recognize the highly technical and difficult assignment in redrawing the map for the third most diverse state with the fourth-highest AAPI [Asian-American and Pacific Islander] population in the country and fifth-fastest-growing state in the nation.

This does not have to be the zero-sum game that it is shaping up to be, that would force communities of interest to fight each other for more representation. So we come here today to testify in opposition as part of a larger coalition of community partners.

As Taylor Patterson mentioned right before me, if we break one community, we break all communities. We urge the Committee to take into account the voices that are being submitted right now from the people that elected you and are counting on this Committee to draw maps that recognize the diversity. Be fair. Be equitable. Thank you for listening to us.

Benjamín Challinor, Policy Director, Faith in Action Nevada:

Good afternoon, members of the Select Committee. My name is Benjamín Challinor, and I am the Policy Director with Faith in Action Nevada. Our organization is also a member of the Nevadans Count Coalition. First, I would like to thank the Committee for the amendment. You have addressed our concerns specifically with Sun Valley, making sure that our community is kept whole. That was very important to us, but we are also a statewide organization doing work in southern Nevada. As a member of the Nevadans Count Coalition, we are still here to make sure that there is still more work done on our congressional maps, specifically Congressional District 1. We want to make sure that we are able to take a look at the communities and actually make sure that we have a Latino-majority district, that way their voice is not being diluted within CD 1 and that communities in our other congressional districts that have minority representation, including CD 4, are not being pitted against each other. Thank you so much.

Maria-Teresa Liebermann-Parraga, Deputy Director, Battle Born Progress:

Hello, everyone. For the record, my name is Maria-Teresa Liebermann-Parraga, and I am the Deputy Director of Battle Born Progress. We see the new revisions and appreciate the effort with this revised map that was released earlier today; however, there is still more work to do in order to truly reflect the community's desires, as you have heard the past few days.

Higher-income communities are still being mixed in with working-class communities, pitting them against each other, and the Latino community is still being split. I am here because I grew up in this community that we are talking about, specifically in CD 1, right on Flamingo and Bruce. I grew up there with a mother who worked two housekeeping jobs to put food on the table. She is watching right now—hi, Mom. I went to schools there. This is the community I know and love. I am from that community.

I want to make this very clear and put it on the record that our organization and our coalition does not work for a party, a candidate, nor any elected official. Contrary to what many may think in this process, we can come up with our own comments, concerns, talking points, and testimony. It is what we do every day. We are working with partners in the community on this issue every single day, as you have heard. It is as simple as that. The community is asking you to keep them together. I encourage you to look at the map; Nevadans Count Coalition has uploaded and revised map number 787 [[Exhibit I](#)] to comply with all redistricting rules. Since my mom is watching and there are probably other folks that speak Spanish mostly, I want to say a few words. [Ms. Liebermann-Parraga spoke in Spanish.] Thank you.

Chair Miller:

With that, we will move on to testimony, about 15 minutes, on the phone. Again, we do have Spanish translation available on the phone. Let us go to the first person on the phone.

Nick Arellano, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

Good afternoon, Chair Miller and members of the Assembly Select Committee on Redistricting and Elections. My name is Nick Arellano. This is my first redistricting process. Ten years ago, I was a freshman in high school in Congressional District 1. I grew up in a Mexican-American household in which traditional values were ingrained in the culture, not politics. Redistricting processes, elections, and so much more were not part of the conventional life lessons we learned, so I had to take matters into my own hands and become that educational resource to my family. After I finished school, I became more involved in learning how much my vote meant for people like me. As I have navigated from midterms to presidential elections, I have come to realize that education in these processes were so dire. So many people had no idea what the Senate even represented. So now I am hosting workshops where I am simply educating people on basic concepts, like the Legislature, its importance, congressional districts and why they exist, and so forth.

As I took the time to look at the maps, it is easy to see that they dilute the power of the Latinx communities. I have to note that taking concerns from various communities is helpful in this challenging process. However, it still fails to reflect what is now the third most diverse state in the country. There is no sense pitting us against Henderson and any rural communities outside of Boulder City, frankly. Our priorities and needs are being undermined, and our representatives must take another look at Congressional District 1 and look further into the dilution of power. It can unravel in the next ten years. That is my testimony. Thank you.

Sylvia Lazos, Private Citizen, Henderson, Nevada:

My name is Sylvia Lazos. I am a longtime community leader of southern Nevada's Latino community as well as by profession a law professor. I want to bring to your attention, first and foremost, that the numbers that you are using to estimate the demographics—percentage white, percentage Latino, et cetera—may be off. In fact, I do think they are off. The census numbers show that the white population is 45.9 percent. Yet when you do the numbers on the MyDistricting website, you come up with 50.11 percent. That is a deviation of almost 5 percentage points. I think this needs to be immediately addressed by LCB so that you are not addressing redistricting maps with wrong data in them. I think this would be fundamentally flawed if you were to defend these maps in court.

The second issue I want to bring to your attention is that one of the members of the Committee has been talking about non-majority as being kind of the relevant measure that we should be looking at. I want to, again, underscore that the Voting Rights Act does not think about non-whites or non-majority. It thinks about minority groups whose voice has been diluted or who are no longer able to elect a representative of their choice. For example, Texas has a MALDEF [Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund] redistricting legal challenge, and it is not because non-majority voters do not have sufficient

voice—it is because Latino voters do not have sufficient voice. So in your analysis, please do not use non-majority numbers but, again, break it down by the particular groups.

Finally, I want to point out that we live in segregated communities. Latinos are not dispersed evenly in residential southern Nevada. I live in a neighborhood, Green Valley, where I am basically the only Latina in five blocks around me. The Latino community is identifiable. It lives in a segregated area. We know exactly where they are—north and east Las Vegas, Whitney, Twin Lakes, Eastland Heights. This community has been fractured in three in the congressional district maps. Their interests are distinct, they vote as a group, and they have policy interests that they want to see pursued. This raises immediately—and should raise for the Committee—issues around Voting Rights Act representation.

Finally, I want to point out that this can be a win-win. Nobody wants to get locked into a battle when we can come out to a compromise. I commend not only the map that you have heard about, 787 [[Exhibit I](#)], but my own map, which I have submitted this morning, 797. The Lazos map and the Emily map are two maps that you should look at as providing a way out of deadlock.

Chair Miller:

Caller, your three minutes are up. If you have any additional comments, please submit them in writing [[Exhibit J](#)].

Natalie Hernandez, Director of Organizing, Make the Road Nevada:

Hi. Good afternoon, everybody. Thank you, Madam Chair and members of the Committee. For the record, my name is Natalie Hernandez. I am the Director of Organizing with Make the Road Nevada. We are also a member of the Nevadans Count Coalition. Make the Road Nevada represents working-class immigrant Latinx people all over our great state of Nevada. I am here to testify in opposition of the proposed maps in S.B. 1.

As a lot of my counterparts have told you, I am also Latina who grew up, and still currently lives, in the east side of Las Vegas. I was highly disappointed in yesterday's revised maps not including the feedback from our Latinx community. I am, however, delighted to see that this body is open to making more changes that ensure that the maps are representative of the residents. Our community here in Clark County embodies the definition of communities of interest. We share bilingual and bicultural characteristics, our children attend the same schools, we are employed in the same work sectors, and we celebrate one another's cultures. Our community should not be separated. We see the Legislature is trying and we thank you, but we are not where we need to be. Affluent communities are still being pit against working-class communities, and Latino communities are still being split.

We ask that the Legislature consider the Nevadans Count Coalition's map, map number 787 [[Exhibit I](#)], and make efforts to keep our communities together. To mobilize this community, our Latinx voters, community leaders, and organizations have come out in opposition. As others have mentioned here before, we are not here for parties, we are here for our

[Ms. Hernandez spoke in Spanish], for our people, and I hope you all are, too. Thank you so much.

[[Exhibit K](#) was also submitted.]

Guillermo Barahona, Civic Engagement Director, Chispa Nevada:

Good afternoon. For the record, my name is Guillermo Barahona, and I am the Civic Engagement Director for Chispa Nevada. We are partners with the Nevadans Count Coalition, and we are in strong opposition to S.B. 1.

From the school board to the interim redistricting committee, county commissioners and city council meetings, community members have been urging our elected officials to put communities of interest first. That means having meaningful public input. To put it into perspective, it means providing community members with an ample amount of time to look at the proposed maps, allowing them to provide their feedback, and actually incorporating their feedback. While we are excited to see that this party incorporated the feedback of the Indigenous community to keep the Walker River Paiute Tribe in one congressional district and that you all are making the necessary strides to make the changes needed, these maps are still not where they should be, as the Latino community is still being split and affluent communities are still being pit against the working-class communities.

Redistricting happens once every ten years. The decisions this body will make will drastically affect our communities, and it is important to incorporate their feedback. Last night, Nevadans Count published a revised version of the congressional maps [[Exhibit I](#)] that reflects the feedback received from your constituents. I urge the Committee to consider this map and make the necessary changes to incorporate their feedback. I urge this body to consider the over 300,000 Latinx residents in CD 1 and ensure that the proposed congressional map incorporates their feedback. Thank you.

Jim Hindle, Vice Chair, Nevada Republican Party:

Good afternoon. Members of the Assembly, I am Jim Hindle, Vice Chair of the Nevada Republican Party. On behalf of the Republicans in the great state of Nevada, I would like to communicate our strong opposition to Senate Bill 1. Nevada is a diverse state on every measure and a swing state given our demographic mix and political character. Based on that, we want to emphasize the questions and issues regarding these amended maps specifically highlighted by Assemblyman Matthews and Assemblywoman Tolles. The proposed amended maps do not achieve the majority's stated goal of significantly increasing representation from minority communities. Instead, it divides communities and splits counties. As stated by Assemblyman Matthews, the minority caucus has proposed maps that achieve smaller deviations between target and actual populations across the proposed districts. We are very disappointed that the minority caucus' proposals have not been seriously considered and incorporated into these amended maps. The only conclusion we can draw from the amended proposal is that it is put forward to achieve partisan advantage. For these reasons, we encourage you to oppose Senate Bill 1. Thank you.

[[Exhibit L](#) was also submitted.]

André Wade, State Director, Silver State Equality:

Good day, Chair Miller, members of the Committee. My name is André Wade, and I work as the State Director of Silver State Equality, a statewide LGBTQ+ civil rights organization here in Nevada doing nonpartisan intersectional work. We are a member of the Nevadans Count Coalition, and I am testifying in opposition.

Thank you for all of the work that you have done thus far on redistricting and being responsive on some of the issues and concerns that have been raised. Today, we are here to urge you to take into account some concerns we have regarding the Latinx Nevadans in CD 1, which have not been incorporated. It is imperative that the concerns be reflected in the maps that are drawn, as the decisions made today will be in place for the next ten years and could have dire consequences for Nevadans in the future. That ensures their voices are being heard and needs being met. Nevadans Count Coalition has uploaded [call was disconnected].

Chair Miller:

Caller, are you still there?

André Wade:

[Unintelligible] maps. Thank you.

Quentin Savvoir, Deputy Director, Make It Work Nevada:

Good morning, Committee. My name is Quentin Savvoir. I represent Make It Work Nevada and Black women and Black families that we organize alongside throughout the state. Make It Work Nevada is also part of the Nevadans Count Coalition, and we oppose the proposed boundaries submitted in S.B. 1.

We do appreciate the Governor's work, this Committee's work, as well as all of our legislators' work in making sure that the inmate allocation was corrected and that our incarcerated brothers and sisters are fairly counted and that they are fairly represented in how these maps are drawn. However, when it comes to Nevada being a trailblazer in the country, we have done a great job at protecting and expanding democracy, but the composition of these lines is the most important part of our democracy—it determines who represents our communities at all levels of government. The accuracy and inclusiveness of these lines can be the difference in how resources are allocated in communities that we work in that are often overlooked and left in the margins.

The maps in their current form dilute so much political power from communities of color, especially our Latinx brothers and sisters, and they pit Black and Brown communities against one another. We cannot continue to tout with pride the beauty of our state's diversity if we do not honor the lives and interests of our families, friends, and neighbors. Please give reconsideration to the Nevadans Count Coalition's maps, 787, that were submitted [[Exhibit I](#)]. I appreciate your time.

Chair Miller:

With that, we will return to those providing opposition testimony here in the room.

Assemblywoman Robin L. Titus, Assembly District 38:

I am Assembly Republican Caucus leader Dr. Robin Titus, and I appreciate an opportunity to testify in opposition in front of you today. I have to acknowledge the hard work that has been done by LCB staff, the GIS [geographic information system] folks. This is not an easy task for anybody. I also want to acknowledge that my concerns expressed at the hearing for S.B. 1—the little pizza-shaped community that was in my house was removed. But at the same time, that had given me an incredible poster board that was really good for presentation. I do not have a poster board today, but I do want to draw your attention to what I said earlier, that it was not about me when I testified, it was really about my community of Smith Valley. If you look at the current congressional maps that were presented today, literally the words "Smith Valley" are cut in half because you continue to cut Smith Valley in half.

I share the concerns of the coalition members that presented in front of you today, that their voice was not really heard, especially in one small community. It is my opinion that you took out the most visible objections, the superficial objections that removed our poster board comments, but continue to break up communities.

I would also state that the Republican maps that were presented were also not heard or taken into consideration. We have significant statistical data on our maps that showed—and I want to put this into the record—regarding population deviation, that the majority plan's largest population deviation is 1.64 percent. The largest negative deviation with these new maps is at 3.05 percent. The overall range of deviation is 4.69 percent. The minority party's plan's largest positive deviation was 0.36 percent. The largest negative deviation was 0.76 percent. The overall range of deviation is 1.12 percent. I would submit that although you did do some amendment, my house included, that was really the visual component of this. We have not gotten to the heart of this. Thank you for your time.

Assemblyman John Ellison, Assembly District 33:

For the record, I am Assemblyman John Ellison, District 33, and I am here in opposition to this bill. I am going to explain to you why. I am going to go back to the special session and the last session and talk about the unfairness. I am going to show you a map right now. This is my district as it is right now. If you look at Elko County, Eureka, all the way down to Eureka, White Pine, and Ely, that shows you the map right now as it is. That is probably half to three-quarters of the state. Now I am going to show you a map that was presented today. Here is District 14. It goes all the way into Elko County. Why am I worried about this? Because the Carlin Trend is inside that whole district. And do I think I have a good Senator there? Yes, I do. But he is not going to be there forever. I am going to show you District 32. It follows the exact same line. Am I happy with my Assemblywoman? Yes, but she is not going to be there forever. Then I am going to show you the map that the Republicans put out with Elko County and Carlin where they are right now. This is being

taken away, and I feel this is a party hit that is going to destroy rural Nevada. I am strongly opposed to this map as presented.

I will tell you, as far as workforce—look at this land right here. What do you see? There is no population there. Very, very little. But it is one of the strongest workforces in rural Nevada that Spanish, Black, Asian, white—there is no color. But I will tell you what, they are fair. But you are going to take that away eventually and that is my problem. I hope you guys re-look at these maps and look at what is going on right now in northern Nevada in Elko County. Thank you.

Chair Miller:

Is there anyone else here in the room who would like to provide testimony in opposition to the proposed amendment for Senate Bill 1? [There was no one.] Not seeing anyone, is there anyone on the telephone?

Vanessa Collins, Nevada State Program Manager, Care in Action:

Good afternoon. My name is Vanessa Collins, and I am the Nevada State Program Manager for Care in Action. We work with women of color across the state to increase their power. We have taken a look at this map. We stand in solidarity with the Nevadans Count Coalition. We want you to strongly oppose this map. When we talk about redistricting, it should not be about partisan politics. It should really be about the communities we are reflecting. Not only does this map dilute CD 1's Latin population's vote, but it is also going to cause problems in CD 4, where you are pitting the African-American community and the Latinx community against each other. We would like you to strongly consider the map that the Nevadans Count Coalition has put forward [[Exhibit I](#)]. I appreciate your time.

Christopher Roman, Private Citizen, Henderson, Nevada:

Thank you for this opportunity to voice my opposition to S.B. 1. My name is Christopher Roman. I am a resident of Henderson, Nevada. I am also an independent voter, not affiliated with any party. I am very sad and disappointed with the congressional districts proposed by S.B. 1. The current proposal will not only dilute, diminish, and severely harm Latino community interests, but I think it will only fuel more divisiveness in our conversation about issues and concerns of importance to all Nevadans. I hope you will reconsider and you will retain the Latino majority in CD 1. From the research I have done as a private citizen, it appears that Professor Lazos' map is probably the best option. I wish you well. I wish you discernment and fairness. Thank you.

Felicia Hayes, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

Good morning. My name is Felicia Hayes. I am a resident of the City of Las Vegas. I live near Lake Mead and D Street in a community called Berkeley Square. I know I came late, but I do oppose S.B. 1 as presented at this time. Thank you.

Assemblywoman Jill Dickman, Assembly District 31:

My name is Jill Dickman, and I represent Assembly District 31. I just wanted to say, when I heard yesterday that there were going to be amendments to this bill, I was so hopeful that

things would change, but the changes that were made are so insignificant and address such insignificant concerns. I would say that from the first time I was here in 2015, I always heard that if nobody is happy, it is probably a good bill because it has been a work of compromise. But when you look at the diverse groups who are not happy with this bill, it is clear that it is not because of compromise or discussion. It seems to me that no one has been listened to. It is just very disappointing. I think these people need to be heard and listened to. Thank you so much.

Chair Miller:

Not seeing anyone else approach here in Carson City for opposition, is there anyone on the line for opposition?

Tammi Tiger, Chair, Board of Directors, Las Vegas Indian Center:

Good afternoon. My name is Tammi Tiger, calling with the Las Vegas Indian Center, a nonprofit organization that has served Clark County since 1972. I am calling today to speak in opposition to the maps proposed in S.B. 1, specifically in CD 1, as they are not considering the months of hard work that our grassroots organizers spent to collect communities of interest's input directly from your constituents. At the Indian Center, we organized a team of Indigenous youth to collect COIs [communities of interest] throughout southern Nevada. We educated them on the importance of having a voice in civics, that we are a nation, a state, a county, a city, and a community that flourishes when we all participate and engage. This redistricting is an opportunity for them to see that. As our state boasts our diversity, we must also ensure that our elected leadership reflects that. Please utilize the input from the Nevadans Count COI maps [[Exhibit I](#)]. Thank you.

Chair Miller:

With that, I will close opposition testimony. [Additional opposition testimony was submitted and will become part of the record: [Exhibit M](#), [Exhibit N](#), and [Exhibit O](#)]. I will open it up for anyone wishing to testify in neutral on the proposed amendment to Senate Bill 1. We will begin here in Carson City and then we will, of course, move back to the phones.

Hawah Ahmad, Chair, Washoe County Senior Services Advisory Board:

Hello, everyone. For the record, my name is Hawah Ahmad. Normally, I am here as a lobbyist for the Clark County Education Association, but today I am here because I am the Chair of the Washoe County Senior Advisory Board. We are all in neutral, but I wanted to make sure that we did not have too many of my seniors call in. One of the things I wanted to bring up is really more of an ask to every member that is in the Legislature currently to go and look at your districts to make sure that your senior communities are not split. When we talk about communities of interest and when we talk about homeowners' associations, one of the things that gets missed is the fact that many of these communities are based on age, they are based on disabilities, and they are based on what resources need to be accessed. So if you have a community that is split—we will use Somersett as an example because there is an elderly community there that utilizes many of the services specifically in Reno/Sparks. If they are put into a different district, it makes access to those services harder, and it makes

it harder for the city and for the county to make sure that we have the resources and services to provide to those individuals.

I appreciate all the effort and the discussion that has gone into these very hard conversations. At the end of the day, on every board that I am on and every organization that I represent and have represented, we are very happy with the way that our state is moving, but we—and I, especially as a citizen of Nevada—want to remind everyone to really look at where we want to be in 10 years and in 20 years because it is our state. We have to make it accessible to our children and accessible to every Nevadan that is here. Of course, I also have to echo that diversity, equity, inclusion, and access are always things that we should be out to attain. Again, I am neutral on this bill because it is the map itself—I cannot determine whether or not every senior community is split or not just because I had to come here after a Senior Advisory Board meeting today. Thank you again for your time.

Chair Miller:

Is there anyone else in the room wishing to make testimony in neutral? [There was no one.] Is there anyone on the telephone line who would like to testify in neutral?

Anna Villatoro, Communications Coordinator, Children's Advocacy Alliance:

Good afternoon, members of the Select Committee. My name is Anna Villatoro. I am here representing Children's Advocacy Alliance. Children's Advocacy Alliance is an independent voice for Nevada's families and children. We are dedicated to advancing public policy in the areas of child safety, health, school readiness, and economic well-being. Children's Advocacy Alliance creates lasting change by tackling the biggest issues our kids and families face.

As you are aware, children are included in the total population of each proposed legislative district. Although they cannot vote, they will be impacted by these district maps for the next ten years. We have included an updated document [[Exhibit P](#)] highlighting the percentage of children in each proposed legislative district in [Senate Bill 1](#). We ask you to consider how to prioritize the needs of children in each district in Nevada. We encourage you to reach out to community groups, families, parents, and children themselves to learn more. Even though children cannot vote, they deserve a voice and champions at the Legislature. Thank you again.

Chair Miller:

With that, I will close the testimony for neutral on the proposed amendment to [Senate Bill 1](#). Under Assembly Standing Rule 57.4, we have been granted the ability by Speaker Frierson to work session this amendment and Senate bill. With that, we will move into a work session.

[Senate Bill 1 \(1st Reprint\)](#): Revises the election districts for members of the Legislature, members of the State Board of Education and Representatives in Congress and the petition districts for certain statewide initiatives or referendums. (BDR 17-9)

Since we have heard the amendment in detail today, I will take a motion to amend and do pass based on the submitted amended joint majority maps.

ASSEMBLYMAN YEAGER MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
SENATE BILL 1 BASED ON THE SUBMITTED AMENDED JOINT
MAJORITY MAPS.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.] Not seeing any, I will take a vote.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN HANSEN, LEAVITT,
MATTHEWS, AND TOLLES VOTED NO.)

I will take the floor statement. Moving to our next agenda item, we will open public comment. There is no one approaching for public comment here in Carson City. Is there anyone on the lines? [There was no one.]

With that, I will close public comment. I do want to thank all of the Committee members for your attention, tenacity, and active participation in this process and for everyone who has also engaged and participated in this process. We will have floor soon. That is the most specific time I can give you in legislative time.

Seeing no further business before this Committee, we are adjourned [at 1:03 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Julieanna McManus
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblywoman Brittney Miller, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

[Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster.

[Exhibit C](#) is a document containing maps of proposed congressional districts, presented by Haley Proehl, Senior Policy Analyst and Geographic Information System Specialist, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, in regard to [Senate Bill 1](#).

[Exhibit D](#) is a document titled "Proposed United States House of Representatives Plan - DEM-CON-15-Nov-2021," presented by Kathy Steinle, Redistricting Specialist, Information Technology Services, Legislative Counsel Bureau; and Michael Stewart, Research Director, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, in regard to [Senate Bill 1](#).

[Exhibit E](#) is a document containing maps of proposed Senate districts, presented by Haley Proehl, Senior Policy Analyst and Geographic Information System Specialist, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, in regard to [Senate Bill 1](#).

[Exhibit F](#) is a document titled "Proposed Senate Plan - DEM-SEN21-14Nov2021," presented by Kathy Steinle, Redistricting Specialist, Information Technology Services, Legislative Counsel Bureau; and Michael Stewart, Research Director, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, in regard to [Senate Bill 1](#).

[Exhibit G](#) is a document containing maps of proposed Assembly districts, presented by Haley Proehl, Senior Policy Analyst and Geographic Information System Specialist, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, in regard to [Senate Bill 1](#).

[Exhibit H](#) is a document titled "Proposed Assembly Plan - DEM-ASM42-14Nov2021," presented by Kathy Steinle, Redistricting Specialist, Information Technology Services, Legislative Counsel Bureau; and Michael Stewart, Research Director, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, in regard to [Senate Bill 1](#).

[Exhibit I](#) is a document containing maps of proposed congressional districts by the Nevadans Count Coalition, submitted by Noé Orosco, Member, Nevadans Count Coalition, in regard to [Senate Bill 1](#).

[Exhibit J](#) is a letter from Sylvia Lazos, Private Citizen, Henderson, Nevada, submitted in opposition to [Senate Bill 1](#).

[Exhibit K](#) is written testimony by Natalie Hernandez, Director of Organizing, Make the Road Nevada, submitted in opposition to [Senate Bill 1](#).

[Exhibit L](#) is written testimony by Jim Hindle, Vice Chair, Nevada Republican Party, submitted in opposition to [Senate Bill 1](#).

[Exhibit M](#) is a letter from the Elko County Board of Commissioners, submitted in opposition to [Senate Bill 1](#).

[Exhibit N](#) is a letter from Tracey Smith of Faith Organizing Alliance, submitted in opposition to [Senate Bill 1](#).

[Exhibit O](#) is a letter from Eli Trimble, Private Citizen, Sparks, Nevada, submitted in opposition to [Senate Bill 1](#).

[Exhibit P](#) is a document titled "Get to Know Your District," submitted by the Children's Advocacy Alliance in regard to [Senate Bill 1](#).